

III. REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 2, 3 and 5 were previously canceled. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Brown et al. (US 6970918B2) (hereinafter referred to as “Brown”).

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection over Brown, Applicant asserts that Brown does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*: “said proxy receiving said response over the Internet network and detecting at least one cookie in the response and storing the at least one cookie and an Internet address of the content server associated with the at least one cookie in a user context database and transmitting said response to said user over the Internet network after said cookie has been removed from said response.” Brown does not teach this feature of Applicant’s invention. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in the specification at page 6 lines 15-22.

Prior to the above noted amendment, the Office cites, *inter alia*, Brown at col.6 lines 27-42 and col. 4 lines 62-65 as teaching “storing the at least one cookie and an

Internet address of the content server in a user context database.” Office Action p.3.

Applicant asserts Brown does not teach this feature and does not teach this feature as amended.

As Brown discusses, “the process used in the preferred embodiment of the invention is depicted in FIG. 4.” Col. 4 lines 47-48. Reviewing the process disclosed by Brown in FIG. 4 and Col. 4 line 47 – Col. 6 line 42, Brown does not teach or suggest in reference to a response “detecting at least one cookie in the response and storing the at least one cookie and an Internet address of the content server associated with the at least one cookie in a user context database.”

Claim 1, recites, *inter alia*, “wherein said proxy is configured to establish a connection to said content server on behalf of said user when receiving said request from said user, and wherein said cookie is transmitted by said configured proxy to said content server when said user sends subsequent requests for the URL of the said content server, even if said content server does not belong in the said proxy server’s domain.” Brown does not teach this feature of applicant’s invention.

The Office cites Brown at “Figure 2a” as teaching this feature. Office Action p.4. A review of Figure 2a and the associated paragraph of Brown describing Figure 2a (Col. 3 line 49 – Col. 4 line 2) does not reveal a teaching of this feature. As stated by Brown “With reference now to FIG. 2a, there is depicted a block diagram of a preferred Internet connection between client device 10 and content provider 18 via content server 16.” The cited portions of the reference and Brown generally fail to teach this feature of Applicant’s claim.

Accordingly, claim 1, is not anticipated by Brown. Applicant asserts the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to the dependent claim, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependent claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

Date: November 23, 2009

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Hoffman, Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)